



# CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

820 First Street, NE, Suite 510, Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202-408-1080 Fax: 202-408-1056 center@cbpp.org www.cbpp.org

## ESTIMATED EFFECTS OF THE LOSS OF VOUCHER FUNDING ON THE ELDERLY, PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND WORKING FAMILIES IN 2005 AND 2010

### New Hampshire

This table displays estimates of the effects of cuts in housing voucher assistance on the elderly, people with disabilities and working families under the actual 2005 voucher funding level and under the Administration's budget plan for 2010 based on the limited information available to the public. "Working families" are defined in this table as families obtaining at least some of their income from wages.

The table below can be read as follows: "In 2005, the shortfall in voucher funding needed to support its vouchers will cause [housing agency] to cut an estimated [Overall Number of Vouchers Cut] vouchers. As a result, [2005 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families assisted] elderly/disabled/working families will go without housing assistance. Information available on the Administration's budget plans through 2010 indicate the voucher funding shortfall will grow substantially, resulting in an estimated further cut in the number elderly/disabled/working families assisted by [2010 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted Below 2005 Level]."

HUD Code	Housing Agency Name	Current Number of Authorized Vouchers	Overall Number of Vouchers Cut in 2005	2005 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted			2010 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted Below 2005 Level		
				Elderly	People with Disabilities	Working Families	Elderly	People with Disabilities	Working Families
NH011	Berlin HA	285	-12	-3	-5	-3	-14	-19	-11
NH012	Claremont HA	140	-6	-1	-3	-1	-4	-14	-6
NH005	Concord HA	224	-9	-2	-4	-3	-10	-17	-13
NH022	Derry HRA	100	-4	-1	-2	-1	-4	-7	-6
NH003	Dover HA	347	-12	-2	-5	-5	-8	-25	-24
NH014	Exeter HA	169	-7	-3	-2	-2	-12	-10	-7

HUD Code	Housing Agency Name	Current Number of Authorized Vouchers	Overall Number of Vouchers Cut in 2005	2005 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted			2010 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted Below 2005 Level		
				Elderly	People with Disabilities	Working Families	Elderly	People with Disabilities	Working Families
NH018	Franklin	89	-4	-1	-1	-1	-3	-6	-4
NH010	Keene HA	359	-15	-2	-12	0	-9	-53	0
NH007	Laconia HRA	407	-17	-4	-7	-4	-17	-32	-19
NH015	Lancaster	68	-3	0	-1	-1	-2	-3	-4
NH009	Lebanon	163	-7	-2	-3	-2	-9	-13	-9
NH001	Manchester HRA	1,813	-73	-21	-29	-23	-92	-127	-99
NH002	Nashua HA	758	-31	-5	-9	-13	-20	-37	-56
NH013	Newmarket	72	-3	-1	-1	-1	-3	-5	-4
NH901	NH Housing Finance Authority	3,222	-130	-26	-48	-45	-113	-209	-198
NH016	Northumberland	15	-1	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1
NH004	Portsmouth HA	406	-17	-3	-5	-7	-11	-23	-30
NH008	Rochester HA	182	-7	-1	-4	-2	-4	-15	-8
NH006	Somersworth HA	183	-7	-2	-2	-2	-7	-10	-11
<b>Total for New Hampshire</b>		<b>9,002</b>	<b>-361</b>	<b>-79</b>	<b>-144</b>	<b>-116</b>	<b>-345</b>	<b>-628</b>	<b>-510</b>

The estimated numbers of each type of family affected are based on the current proportion of an agency's vouchers now received by families of that type, based on data in HUD's Public and Indian Housing Information (PIC) Center system as of January 21, 2005 (accessed at <http://pic.hud.gov/pic/RCRPublic/rcrmain.asp>). The estimates for 2010 assume that the demographic mix of families served in 2010 would be the same as in January 2005. The numbers of vouchers cut for each type of family do not add up to the total cut because some vouchers are received by families that do not have earnings and are not headed by a person who is elderly or disabled. For an explanation of how we derived these estimates, see the papers referenced at [www.cbpp.org/hous2-18-05hous-states.htm](http://www.cbpp.org/hous2-18-05hous-states.htm). All figures in the table assume that agencies will respond to funding shortfalls by reducing the number of families assisted. Agencies also have some limited flexibility to reduce the level of assistance provided per family, for example by shifting rental burdens onto needy households or reducing the maximum amount of rent a voucher can cover (and therefore limiting the ability of voucher households to live outside high-poverty neighborhoods in areas that may be safer and with better schools and more job opportunities). If agencies took these measures, the reduction in the number of families assisted could be somewhat smaller.